



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

vb

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/959,013	10/28/97	O'MALLEY	226/286

022249
LYON AND LYON LLP
SUITE 4700
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2066

HM12/0915

EXAMINER
HAYES, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1645	9

DATE MAILED: 09/15/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/959,013

Applicant
O'Malley et al

Examiner
Robert C. Hayes

Group Art Unit
1645



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 6, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 11-19, 30, and 31 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 11-19, 30, and 31 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 11-14 & 30-31, drawn to nucleic acid sequences encoding modified/mutated glucocorticoid receptors, vectors, transformed cells and a plasmid, classified in Class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 15-19, drawn to a method of using a modified/mutated glucocorticoid receptor protein, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.2.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P.

§ 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the nucleic acids of Group I can be used in other materially different processes, such as to encode the full length protein, detect or inhibit expression of the protein, or used in gene therapy. In contrast, the method of Group II requires non-natural ligands and transactivation of glucocorticoid responsive genes neither of which are required for the invention of Group II, and vice versa.

Art Unit: 1645

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the non-coextensiveness of the search and examination for each group would constitute an undue burden on the examiner to search and consider each of these separable groups with their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

4. A telephone call was made to Charles Berkman on September 13, 1999 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (703) 305-3132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (703) 308-3995. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.
September 13, 1999



ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600